

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/850,203	05/08/2001	Yuji Saito	101213-00009	9728
75	90 09/30/2005		EXAM	INER
ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC			DOVE, TRACY MAE	
Suite 600 1050 Connectic	ut Avenue, N.W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	on, DC 20036-5339		1745	

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		(					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/850,203	SAITO ET AL.					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Tracy Dove	1745					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 22 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no							
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO							
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for application and the issue of new matter.							
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 USC 112, 1<sup>st</sup>, rejection.</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling</li> </ul>							
the non-allowable claim(s).							
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 2-5 and 11-13. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	☑ Will not be entered, or b) ☐ Wilded below or appended.	ill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence	is necessary				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a (1).				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	ched.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allows	ance hecause.				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

13. Other: \_\_\_\_.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claim 2 has been amended to recite "are integrally formed" and "said same material comprising a high polymer solid electrolytic material". Claim 13 has been amended to recite "said same material comprising a high polymer solid electrolytic material". These added limitation to claims 2 and 13 would require further search and/or consideration. Also, claim 4 does not further limit claim 3.

Regarding Applicant argument against the prior art, "said same material comprising a high polymer solid electrolytic material" encompasses a material that comprises an electrolytic material and an interconnect material because "comprising" is open language.

/ TRACY DOVE PRIMARY EXAMINER